

ppa



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/679,396	10/03/2000	Christopher E. Phillips	032001-011	6677

21839 7590 01/12/2004

BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

CONNOLLY, MARK A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2115

13

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/679,398

Applicant(s)

PHILLIPS ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Connolly

Art Unit

2115

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 and 11-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-7 and 11-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: It is unclear as to what select rows and columns the configuration content is being applied to. For examining purposes it has been interpreted by the examiner that the select rows and columns correspond to the active configuration plane and that the application of configuration content to those intersections of select rows and columns correspond to the reconfiguration of the active configuration plane.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 5 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greenbaum et al [Greenbaum] US Pat No 6077315.

4. Referring to claim 5, Greenbaum explicitly teaches an on-chip configuration cache (204) containing a multiplicity of stored configurations (116) [figs. 1 and 2 and col. 5 lines 59-65].

Although Greenbaum is not explicit that each configuration is identified by a unique off-chip address used to fetch that configuration, it is well known that data stored in a cache is identified by the data's unique address in external memory, which is translated into an address location in

Art Unit: 2115

the cache. The unique address in external memory is interpreted as a unique off-chip address because the memory is separate from the cache.

5. Referring to claim 20, Greenbaum explicitly teaches an on-chip configuration cache (204) containing a multiplicity of stored configurations (116) [figs. 1 and 2 and col. 5 lines 59-65]. Although Greenbaum is not explicit that each configuration is identified by a unique off-chip address used to fetch that configuration, it is well known that data stored in a cache is identified by the data's unique address in external memory, which is translated into an address location in the cache. The unique address in external memory is interpreted as a unique off-chip address because the memory is separate from the cache. In addition, Greenbaum further teaches that additional configurations (116) are stored in an external memory (104) [col. 5 lines 59-65 and fig. 1].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 6 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenbaum as applied to claims 5 and 20 above, and further in view of Singh et al [Singh] US Pat No 6324621.

8. Referring to claim 6, although Greenbaum teaches that configurations are stored in a cache, it is not explicitly taught that the configurations within the cache are compressed. Singh explicitly teaches a cache which stores compressed data [col. 1 lines 41-43, col. 2 lines 16-19

Art Unit: 2115

and figs. 1 and 5B]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Greenbaum system to compress the configurations stored within the cache because it would improve “performance on par with increasing a cache’s size without incurring the cost expense of the cache size increase” as is explicitly taught by Singh [col. 2 lines 18-20].

9. Referring to claims 11 and 12, although Greenbaum teaches a configuration cache [204 fig. 2], it is not explicitly taught that the configuration includes a compressed and decompressed cache. Singh explicitly teaches a cache which includes a compressed and decompressed cache [col. 3 lines 4-12 and figs. 1 and 5B]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Greenbaum system to include a compressed and decompressed cache because it would improve “performance on par with increasing a cache’s size without incurring the cost expense of the cache size increase” as is explicitly taught by Singh [col. 2 lines 18-20].

10. Referring to claim 13, Singh explicitly teaches that data read from the cache is read from the decompressed cache (L3) [col. 4 lines 31-39]. Therefore it is obvious that in the Greenbaum-Singh system, the active configuration plane reads and uses configuration content that is stored in the decompressed cache. The active configuration plane is interpreted as the Reconfigurable Logic Resources 202 that is configured by configuration cache 204 in fig. 2 in Greenbaum.

11. Referring to claim 14, Singh explicitly teaches an on-chip compressed cache [figs. 1 and 5B and col. 3 lines 13-16].

12. Referring to claim 15, this is rejected on the same basis as set forth hereinabove. It is interpreted that the configuration content is promoted from the decompressed cache when it is used to configure the active configuration plane.

Art Unit: 2115

13. Referring to claim 16, Greenbaum explicitly teaches an on-chip configuration cache (204) for configuring an active configuration plane (202) [figs. 1 and 2 and col. 5 lines 59-65]. Greenbaum does not explicitly teach that the system includes a compressed and decompressed cache wherein compressed configuration content is decompressed from the compressed cache into the decompressed cache and wherein the decompressed configuration in the decompressed cache is used to configure an active configuration plane. Singh explicitly teaches a compressed and decompressed cache wherein compressed data is decompressed from the compressed cache into the decompressed cache [col. 3 lines 4-12, col. 4 lines 31-39 and figs. 1 and 5B]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Greenbaum system to include a compressed and decompressed cache to store the configuration content because it would improve “performance on par with increasing a cache’s size without incurring the cost expense of the cache size increase” as is explicitly taught by Singh [col. 2 lines 18-20].

In addition, Singh explicitly teaches that data read from the cache is read from the decompressed cache (L3) [col. 4 lines 31-39]. Therefore it is obvious that in the Greenbaum-Singh system, the active configuration plane reads and uses configuration content that is stored in the decompressed cache.

14. Referring to claims 17, 21 and 22, these are rejected on the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

15. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenbaum as applied to claims 5 and 20 above, and further in view of Silberman et al [Silberman] US Pat No 6088763.

Art Unit: 2115

16. Referring to claim 7, Greenbaum does not explicitly teach address identification through the use of a content-addressable memory. Silberman teaches that when accessing a cache, an address translation occurs [col. 1 lines 34-37]. Silberman further teaches that this address translation can be improved by employing a content-addressable memory (CAM) [col. 1 lines 42-45]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the address translation means through the use of a CAM as taught by Silberman in the Greenbaum system because it would "improve the translation process" as is explicitly taught by Silberman.

17. Claims 18 and 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenbaum and Singh as applied to claims 5-6, 11-17 and 20-22 above, and further in view of Yoshida US Pat No 5951708.

18. Referring to claim 18, although the Greenbaum-Singh system teaches an on chip decompressed cache for storing configuration content, Greenbaum and Singh do not explicitly teach decoding configuration content from the on-chip decompressed cache. In summary, the Greenbaum-Singh system is silent on decoding the compressed data. Yoshida explicitly teaches decoding compressed data [col. 5 lines 32-42]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the decoding means taught in Yoshida into the Greenbaum-Singh system because it would provide a means to detect any errors in the configuration content.

19. Referring to claim 19, it is obvious that only the portions of the configuration within the reconfigurable chip which need to be reconfigured will be changed because it is well known in the art that overwriting data with identical data is redundant and decreases performance.

Art Unit: 2115

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Connolly whose telephone number is (703) 305-7849. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5PM (except every first Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas C Lee can be reached on (703) 305-9717. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Mark Connolly
Examiner
Art Unit 2115

mc
January 5, 2004



THOMAS LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100